

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) allegedly as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 11-127297 to Tanimoto.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-9 are amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are presently pending for consideration.

Substance of the Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for his courtesy extended during the telephone interview on April 19, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the amendments to at least independent claim 1 raises new issues that require further consideration and/or search.

Accordingly, Applicants file concurrently herewith a Request for Reconsideration to enter this Amendment. Applicants respectfully request the Office to consider this Amendment and respectfully expect a Non-Final Office Action be issued in the next communication from the Office.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) allegedly as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 11-127297 to Tanimoto.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims for at least the following reasons.

(i) Independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 7:

With respect to independent claims 1 and 6, as amended, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto fails to teach or suggest at least the features of “determines whether a plurality of image data and a plurality of attribute information included in the image information are

arranged in a predetermined sequence based on whether an offset value of an image file directory included in a header information of the image information is a predetermined value and whether a character sequence specified by a software tag filed included in the image file directory matches a predetermined character sequence, and decompresses the image data when the image data and the attribute information are determined to be arranged in the predetermined sequence.”

In addition, with respect to independent claims 2 and 7, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto fails to teach or suggest at least the features of “performing at least a two-level process to identify whether a plurality of image data and a plurality of attribute information included in the image information are arranged in a predetermined sequence, and immediately begins decompressing the image data when the image file format of the image information is identified as being in the predetermined sequence,” and “identifying whether a plurality of image data and a plurality of attribute information included in the image information are arranged in a predetermined sequence based on a first information provided in a header information and a second information provided in a first image file directory of the image information.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified features are disclosed in the original specification at paragraphs [0010], [0035], [0037], [0041]-[0044], [0047], and in the original FIG. 4, and steps S33 and S34 shown in FIG. 5.

On page 4 of the Action, the Office alleges that Tanimoto disclose the features of “header information included in the image information indicates that a plurality of image data and a plurality of attribute information are arranged in a predetermined sequence on a per-page basis in a whole image information, decompresses the image data included in the image information on acquiring the attribute information (Drawings 1, 2, and 4, paragraphs [0004]-[0010], [0013], [0016], [0024], [0028], lines 3-6, [0030] lines 1-4, [0031] lines 1-3, [0034]-[0039], and [0049]-

[0050], reference states that the image data is decompressed at the time of reception, which is analogous to the claim limitation, further TIFF file headers are always arranged in a predetermined sequence).” Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed invention, Tanimoto teaches at paragraphs [0016], [0017], and [0036]-[0039], a checking process to determine whether the incoming image data is a TIFF file having a known order format using only a single information (i.e., an offset value store in the TIFF header information). Specifically, as shown in Drawing 2, step 4 of Tanimoto discloses a checking process using only the offset value stored in the TIFF header information to identify if the TIFF image data is in a sequential order (Tanimoto, Drawing 2 and paragraphs [0036]-[0039]). In addition, as shown in Drawing 4, Tanimoto clearly does not teach storing of and using of additional identifying information other than the offset value in the TIFF image data to properly identify the format of the incoming TIFF image data. As such, Tanimoto only discloses a one-level process using single information to check the format of incoming TIFF image data.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the process of Tanimoto does not include at least a two-level checking system using first information and second information provided in the image information, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto is completely silent with regard to the above-described features, hence the features disclosed in independent claim 1. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention of claims 2 and 7 are distinguished over Tanimoto for reasons similar to those presented above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto does not teach or suggest at least the features of independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 7, thus, Tanimoto fails to anticipate at least the independent claims 1, 2, 6, and 7.

(ii) Independent claims 4, 5, 8 and 9:

With respect to independent claims 4 and 5, as amended, Applicants respectfully assert that Tanimoto fails to teach or suggest at least the features of “exchanging with a sender device, negotiation information in connection with a layout sequence of the image data and the attribute information,” “receiving a information based on a result of the exchange and the image information, wherein the information is received prior to the image information and the information specifies the image file format of the image information as being in a predetermined sequence,” and “exchanging with a receiver device, negotiation information in connection with a layout sequence of the image data and the attribute information, wherein prior to transmitting the image information, outputs a information based on a result of the exchange specifying the image file format of the image information as being in the predetermined sequence.” Applicant respectfully submit that the above-described features are disclosed in the original specification at paragraphs [0051], lines 19-25, [0054], lines 12-15, [0055], lines 21-24, and steps S43-S47 of original FIG. 6 and steps S51-S53 of original FIG. 7.

On page 5 of the Action, the Office alleges that Tanimoto discloses an image information processing apparatus including a communication unit that “exchanges, with a sender device externally connected via a network, negotiation information in connection with a layout sequence of the image data and attribute information” and “a controller that decompresses the image data included in the image information on acquiring the attribute information, when the received negotiation information indicates that a plurality of attribute information and a plurality of image data of the image information are arranged in a predetermined sequence on a per-page basis in a whole image information.” In addition, the Office further alleges on pages 5-6 of the Action that Tanimoto discloses “a communication unit exchanges, with a receiver device

externally connected via a network and is to send image information, negotiation information in connection with a layout sequence of image data and attribute information and that outputs the generated image information, wherein a plurality of attribute information and a plurality of image data of the image information are arranged in a predetermined sequence on a per-page basis in a whole image information based on a result of exchange of the negotiation information (Drawings 1, 2 and 4, paragraphs [0004]-[0010], [0013], [0016], [0024], [0028] lines 3-6, [0030] lines 1-4, [0031] lines 1-3, [0034]-[0039], and [0049]0[0050]).” Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed invention, Tanimoto teaches a facsimile device adapted to transmit and receive electronic data (i.e., TIFF file) delivered through a network by processing the TIFF file using various computer software. Specifically, the device of Tanimoto implements a number of telecommunication features such as general G3 method, function to transmit and receive the image data formed in the TIFF file via e-mail, and function to convert the TIFF image data (i.e., binary data) to text data when transmitting to the network and vice versa (Tanimoto, paragraphs [0028]-[0039]).

However, Tanimoto does not teach or suggest a device enabled to send and receive separate information, other than the image information, about the image file format of the image information (i.e., TIFF image data) prior to transmitting the image information to the network. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that since the device of Tanimoto does not include the above-identified features, Tanimoto fails to teach or suggest at least the features of independent claims 4 and 5, as amended. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention of claims 8 and 9 are distinguished over Tanimoto for reasons similar to those presented above with respect to independent claims 4 and 5. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully assert that Tanimoto does not teach or suggest at least the features of independent claims 4 and 8, thus, Tanimoto fails to anticipate at least the independent claims 4, 5, 8, and 9.

#

In light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn because Tanimoto fails to anticipate the features of amended independent claims 1-9. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 3 is allowable at least for the same reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 2 where it depends from and for each individual feature claim 3 recites.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



Sumiyo Onda
Reg. No. L 0289

Dated: April 23, 2007

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001